

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,159	03/31/2004	R. Scott Stephens	WEYE121926/25350 8194	
28624 7.	7590 03/30/2006 EXAMINER			INER
	USER COMPANY	CORDRAY, DENNIS R		
	AL PROPERTY DEPT.	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
P.O. BOX 9777 FEDERAL WAY, WA 98063			1731	THE DAY TO THE DEL
,			DATE MAILED: 03/30/2006	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/815,159	STEPHENS ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Dennis Cordray	1731	

	Dennis Cordray	1731	
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>10 March 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, af tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailir (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH	ng date of the final reject	ion.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing d	of the fee. The appropriation of the fee. The appropriation of the final Off	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of ne appeal. Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	, will <u>not</u> be entered b	ecause
<ul> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) They present additional claims without canceling a</li> </ul>	nsideration and/or search (see NC ow); tter form for appeal by materially re	TE below); educing or simplifying	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	· -	jootou olamio.	
<ul> <li>4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1</li> <li>5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> <li>6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a</li> </ul>	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co:		
non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:		ill be entered and an	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-14</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	•		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8.  ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	ut before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affida	lotice of Appeal will <u>n</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apper y and was not earlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the application	in condition for allowa	nce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).  13. ☑ Other: See Continuation Sheet.	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)	

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

Application No.

The Declaration filed under 37 CFR 1.131 is not considered timely because it was not submitted according to the following conditions (see MPEP 715.09):

- (A) prior to a final rejection;
- (B) before appeal in an application not having a final rejection;
- (C) after final rejection, but before or on the same date of filing an appeal, upon a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented in compliance with 37 CFR 1.116(e); or
- (D) after the prosecution is closed (e.g., after a final rejection, after appeal, or after allowance) if applicant files the affidavit or other evidence with a request for continued examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 in a utility or plant application filed on or after June 8, 1995; or a continued prosecution application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) in a design application.

With regard to the subject matter of U.S. Patent Application Publication, US 2003/0208859 ("the Neogi reference") used in the prior Final Rejection, dated December 7, 2005, the reference was used only to teach that the addition of small amounts of blue colorant to improve whiteness appearance is known in papermaking. The addition of blue dye to pulp to offset yellownesss is well known in the industry and would be obvious to one skilled in the art.

The other arguments have been addressed in the previous Office Action.

Continuation of 13. Other: The rejection set forth in the prior Office Action, dated December 7, 2005, is maintained.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700